



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OCH, J. *A primer of political economy in catechism form.* (Columbus, O.: Josephinum Press. 1920. Pp. viii, 170.)

Published as a "general survey of the science of political economy as it is taught in the Pontifical College Josephinum," in Columbus, Ohio. Certain topics, as money, land questions, and problems of distribution, are omitted, it being the author's intention to cover the cycle of social sciences in succeeding volumes. The matter is presented in the form of questions and answers.

PARK, R. E. and BURGESS, E. W. *Introduction to the study of sociology.* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press. 1920. \$4.50.)

VON PHILIPPOVICH, E. *Grundriss der politischen Oekonomie.* Vol. 2, *Volkswirtschaftspolitik.* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 1919. Pp. x, 459. 12 M.)

RAWIE, H. C. *Science of value; solving it.* (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins. 1920. Pp. 98. \$1.50.)

ROSS, E. A. *The principles of sociology.* (New York: Century Co. 1920. Pp. xviii, 708. \$4.)

TAWNEY, R. H. *The acquisitive society.* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, & Howe. 1920.)

TIRAZIAN, A. *Zur Kritik der Böhm-Bawerk'schen Kapitaltheorie.* (Innsbrück: Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchdruckerei. 1920. Pp. 151.)

WILLIAMS, J. M. *The foundation of social science.* (New York: Knopf. 1920.)

WITHERS, H. *The case for capitalism.* (New York: Dutton. 1920. Pp. 255.)

Economic History and Geography

An Economic History of Rome. By TENNEY FRANK. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press. 1920. Pp. xi, 310. \$2.50.)

A distinctively American *motiv* runs through this book from beginning to end. It appears on page 62 when Professor Frank is discussing the Roman colonization of Italy: "The constant availability of good lands which the state desired to have occupied against possible encroachment always attracted men and capital not otherwise occupied. Thus the Romans felt no incentive to try new enterprises, to develop industries or to enter commerce on land or sea. During this period of expansion Rome almost isolated herself from transmarine influences." It reappears on page 110 when he is explaining the lack of interest on the part of Rome's government in the commercial opportunities of the Mediterranean world which it was conquering. It comes boldly out

on page 221 when, in dealing with the alleged disinclination of Roman farmers to migrate into the territories annexed during the second century B.C. beyond the frontiers of Italy, he reviews the earlier economic development, concluding with the affirmation that what resulted was "a situation that reminds one strongly of the opening of the American frontiers, which permitted our once flourishing merchant marine to decay and temporarily stemmed the current of New England industries." This parallel, like all historical parallels, needs reservations; but in the main the analogy is sound, and it furnishes a large constructive idea that makes Professor Frank's book an American book. The one economic sphere in which the Romans dominated their political acquisitions was the agrarian sphere; and, as Professor Frank shows conclusively, this was far and away their most important economic sphere—as, indeed, it was in the world generally before the Industrial Revolution.

It is, therefore, as our author remarks, "rather surprising that we never hear of laws to protect Roman farm produce," particularly when one has used the lack of governmental intervention on behalf of Roman merchants as evidence for the insignificance of their interests. But the weighty observation is entered that "it was difficult to secure common action on the part of the farmers. Being without ready means of transportation, they had to consider the advantages of the market nearest at hand, and thus this group readily split into various diverse factions, each moved by different interests." Even more important, however, in this connection is the fact that, once Rome transcended the narrow geographical limits of a city-state, she was incompetent, without modern communications, of organizing in any sense the public opinion of her citizens. Hence the Senate became irresponsible, and sought, subject to the imperative necessity of preserving its own domination in the world by the requisite political and military action, to promote the economic interests of its own class. How a conflict between corporate and individual interests thence arose, the one demanding the strengthening of the Italian peasantry, the other the solvency of the plantation; the one demanding the control of the public service syndicates, the other participation in their magnified profits, is an old story.

Professor Frank does not like telling old stories. He not only denies the magnitude of the private interests engaged in public contracts, pointing out that at the time when the landed property

of the 320,000 citizens was worth \$1,000,000,000, the total revenue of Rome—of which, to be sure, the most went through the hands of contractors both during and after its collection—was less than \$10,000,000 annually; but he cites statistics and argues at length to prove that the Romans, like the Turks (though he does not adduce this most instructive parallel) left the commerce and industry of their city, peninsula, and empire almost exclusively to aliens and freedmen, with the immediate result that neither the government nor the governing society ever gave serious thought to the needs of business and the more serious result that, at the same time that slaves replaced the small farmers in the country, ex-slaves came so to outnumber the old Roman stock in Rome that “nearly 90 per cent of the population permanently resident at Rome in the Empire bore the taint of foreign extraction.” Since, then, the armies after 100 B.C. were recruited mainly from the proletariat, the colonies founded of veterans by Sulla, Caesar, the Triumvirs, and Augustus, while they upset temporarily the régime of big estates in Italy, served in the long run merely to spread the aliens throughout the peninsula; and since the aliens were mainly Orientals “the whole of Italy as well as the Romanized portions of Gaul and Spain were during the Empire dominated in blood by the East” (p. 162).

Novel and startling conclusions these! They are based fundamentally on a census of the Roman graveyards taken by Professor Frank himself with the aid of the inscriptions on the tombstones and published in the *American Historical Review* for 1916. The subject is one that requires further investigation. To me it seems doubtful if the statistics used have enough that is not chance in them to bear the weight of such far-reaching inferences. The Italy that Rome conquered was, of course, a patchwork of stocks, and the *civitas* that Cicero canvassed was naturally, as his brother says, *ex nationum conventu constituta*. The soldiers who entered the revolutionary armies were, indeed, without a property interest in the state, but may they not have been what they were and yet come in large part from the farms of Italy? The strict inference from nomenclature is to the effect that the freedman was ordinarily a Greek—whatever that may signify; so that, if the conclusion of Professor Frank is accepted, we should, perhaps, speak of the Hellenization rather than of the Orientalizing of the West. But it seems odd that if 90 per cent of the population of Rome were Hellenistic the supremacy of Latin in Italy and its

colonies should have been unchallenged. There must be some disturbing factor in the statistics, though I cannot say what it is, unless it be that the headstones of the slaves, aliens, and freedmen, being poorer, have been less subject to destruction, or that through their corporate organizations these elements were disproportionately articulate on their tombstones if not elsewhere.

The supplanting of the Roman and Italic stock by the issue of slaves is, then, another constructive idea on which Professor Frank forms his book. It, too, it is needless to say, may envisage an American situation.

A third *leitmotiv* is the doctrine of the exhaustion of the soil by the prolonged planting of the same crop, a doctrine of which Professor Frank makes much (too much, I think) without mentioning, however, either Simkhovitch or Liebig. It was soil-exhaustion, he claims, which constrained the Latins in the fourth century B.C. "to exchange old lands for new" and which forced the farmers of Italy in the second century B.C. to substitute pastures and orchards for grainfields. The Romans were hard farmers who tended to overwork the land wherever they went and who came to grief only when they had no longer virgin soil on which to move.

But, as Professor Frank properly says, "land-exhaustion is always a relative term." Why then, we ask, should Latium have been exhausted in the fifth century B.C. while Campania and the rest of Italy were not? Professor Frank has his answer ready, and it is one which geologists alone can evaluate. It is because Latium was of uniquely late volcanic formation with an exceptionally thin soil. "The last masses of volcanic ash," he affirms, following Verri (*Origine e Trasformazione della Campagna*), "probably postdate the pyramids of Egypt." Besides, Latium was deforested at an early date (though not, we remark, till the exodus from it was well under way), so that despite most extraordinary efforts to hold the soil in place, the cultivable areas were gradually reduced and the rainfall turned from a beneficent into both an inadequate and malevolent agent.

It seems a paradox that the most expert farmers of antiquity (for that the Romans were such, readers of Cato, Varro, Virgil, Mela, and Columella can hardly doubt) should have ruined the lands they cultivated most expeditiously. But let that pass. The more serious thing is that the over-accelerated exhaustion of the soil of Latium, Italy, and the Roman West in turn is a matter of

inference from its alleged consequences—consequences that are attributed by orthodox historians to other causes deemed adequate.

Among the best features of Professor Frank's book, which is characterized throughout by knowledge, precision of statement, and acuteness of observation, as well as by vigor of style and vitality of thought, is the skill with which he has utilized the archaeological sources of information. This is shown especially in the two chapters (XI and XII) devoted to Industry at the End of the Republic. In the first, the conditions that prevailed in the making and marketing of red glazed pottery, clay lamps, glass, metal ware (iron and bronze), water pipes, and jewelry are discussed with a view to ascertaining what it is that now permits and now prevents the development of a factory producing either for a large city or for a large area. In the second, a typical block in the commercial section of Pompeii is analyzed and the social position and business methods of its residents are established. Important data are thereby won to validate the mediating doctrine that cost of transportation then, as thereafter till the nineteenth century, limited the content of international commerce to military supplies and indispensable food products for great cities and to articles of large value in small bulk. The question as to whether the individual city or the entire empire was a single economic unit is shown to depend upon the commodity concerned, but the final inference is unavoidable that the *polis* or municipality furnished its inhabitants with the great bulk of their goods. It seems to the reviewer that the author is not at all times mindful of this, his own conclusion, and argues occasionally regarding prices as if the entire Mediterranean basin responded everywhere equally to economic stimuli.

And, if I may end this notice of a book that is superior to anything in its field in any language with a further criticism, it is this, that Professor Frank is unjust in his thought to the Hellenistic age. He seems not to appreciate what it means that Hieron of Syracuse built a freight and passenger ship of 4,000 tons burden. To characterize the one epoch in antiquity in which men were making discoveries in pure and applied science comparable with those which have permitted in modern times both the commercial and industrial centralization of vast territories and the application of liberal principles to their government as "the dreary days of the third century when Greece was slowly dwind-

ling to futility" is to subscribe to a prejudice that is hoary without being venerable.

W. S. FERGUSON.

Harvard College.

Economic Statesmanship; the Great Industrial and Financial Problems Arising from the War. By J. ELLIS BARKER. Second edition containing ten additional chapters. (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. 1920. Pp. xii, 613. \$7.00.)

This book is more accurately described as a collection of chapters than as a coherent exposition of a single theme, for its different parts were written, and most of them published, as separate essays. The descriptive part of the volume is a statistical discussion of the economic conditions of various nations, an estimate of their comparative productive capacities in certain staple lines, and an analysis of the major problems, economic and political, which confront their peoples during the period of reconstruction. Separate chapters are devoted to France, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States, treating of the achievements and prospects of these nations both as individuals and in comparison with the conditions peculiar to Great Britain. The chief concern of the book, however, is with British problems of economic and political welfare; ten of the twenty-five chapters are employed exclusively in developing this subject, and the apparent intent of the author in widening the scope of his inquiry to include other nations is to use the conclusions of his study as an example and a warning to British statesmen in their efforts to grapple with the problems of domestic reconstruction. The descriptive and analytical features of the book are admirable; they contain a wealth of economic facts condensed in statistical form and ably presented to the reader, retaining his interest throughout with no sacrifice of accuracy and precision of detail.

Mr. Barker does not succeed so well in the development of the theoretical features of his book. His purpose is to disclose the sources of national power and to deduce from his analysis of the economic achievements of modern nations the policies upon which the future greatness of the British Empire must depend. The power of the state, he concludes, rests upon economic efficiency: "numbers and wealth are the main pillars of nations; they are the foundations of national greatness and independence" (p. 517).